



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,225	09/09/2003	Ryan McIlvenna	MCIL V2	8835
75	7590 10/15/2004		EXAMINER	
Mike M. Gauthier			SMITH, JAMES G	
1264156 Ontario Incorporated o/a Deviat			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
959 Elisabella Street, Unit C			3723	
Sudbury, ON P3A 5K1 CANADA			DATE MAILED: 10/15/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/657,225	MCILVENNA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	James G. Smith	3723				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory p - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by s Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a inn. a reply within the statutory minimum of thir period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON statute, cause the application to become AB	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _	·					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑	This action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
 4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the applicating 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-7 and 9 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 3 and 8 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and place is/are objected. 	ndrawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exar 10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 September 2003 Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	3 is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ the drawing(s) be held in abeyar prection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for form a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in A priority documents have been ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	_					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	B) Paper No(s	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/657,225 Page 2

Art Unit: 3723

DETAILED ACTION

Fees

1. The fee for the multiple dependent claims 3 and 8 has not been remitted. A proper response to this action must include the required fee.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 3 and 8 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim must depend in the alternative. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 3 and 8 have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 4-7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 4 and 5 reclaim the elements already in claim 1, from which they depend.

Claim 9 is indefinite as it merely recites the intended use of the tool with no structural limitations for the apparatus.

5. Normally a claim which fails to comply with the first and/or second paragraph of § 112 will not be analyzed as to whether it is patentable over the prior art since to do so would of necessity require speculation with regard to the metes and bounds of the

Application/Control Number: 10/657,225 Page 3

Art Unit: 3723

claimed subject matter, In re Steele, 308 F.2d 859, 862-63, 134 USPQ 292, (CCPA 1962) and In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 496 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harris, Schall, Rion or Davidson in view of Smith.

Any of Harris, Schall, Rion or Davidson show the claimed invention except for the use of a nail puller in combination with the pliers type tool. Smith suggests that a pliers type tool can also be made with a nail puller at a "central portion" to add an additional function to a single tool. It would therefore be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify any of Harris, Schall, Rion or Davidson by using a nail puller in combination with the pliers type tool because Smith suggests the use of such a combination tool to add the additional function of pulling nails.

- 8. The remaining prior art is cited as of interest at this time.
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James G. Smith whose telephone number is 703-308-1746. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (7:05- 4:35) Fri. off.

Art Unit: 3723

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph J. Hail, III can be reached on 703-308-2687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James G. Smith Primary Examiner Art Unit 3723

jgs 10/14/04